HUMAN AND CITIZEN RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE-LAW FRAMEWORK OF UKRAINE

Andriyko Olga, Bezzubov Dmytro, Skrypniuk Oleksandr, Nagrebelny Volodymyr

DOI: https://doi.org/10.61345/1339-7915.2026.1.1

Annotation. The article provides a comprehensive doctrinal analysis of human and citizen rights and freedoms within the administrative-law framework of Ukraine, which is shaped by constitutional provisions, contemporary trends in the development of public administration, and challenges associated with martial law and transformations in the national security sector. It is established that administrative law is not merely a branch designed to organize the functioning of the executive power, but also one of the key instruments for ensuring, safeguarding, and restoring an individual's legal status under the operation of public-authority mechanisms. The philosophical, methodological, and normative dimensions of protecting individual rights in the sphere of public administration are examined, including the categories of administrative procedure, discretion, legal risk, preventive activity, and state coercion.

Special attention is devoted to shaping a balance between the human-centered nature of the constitutional order and the socio-centered needs of public authority under threats to national security. It is demonstrated that the mechanisms of administrative law ensure the integrity of this balance through procedures of legal certainty, proportionality, reasoned decision-making, accountability, and accessibility of legal protection. The role of institutions of administrative liability and judicial review as elements of guaranteeing human rights in interactions with executive authorities is analyzed.

It is generalized that modern administrative law of Ukraine forms a space in which public authority is obliged to act on the basis of law and in the interests of the individual. Under wartime conditions, this space acquires additional substance, becoming a sphere for protecting life, freedom, security, dignity, and the social resilience of citizens. The article develops an authorial concept of the administrative-law provision of rights and freedoms, combining doctrine, legislative provisions, and the practical needs of state-building.

Key words: human rights, citizen freedoms, administrative law, public administration, administrative procedure, discretion, proportionality, administrative liability, public authority, national security.

1. Introduction.

The contemporary legal system of Ukraine increasingly demonstrates that modern administrative law is ceasing to perform purely authoritative-managerial functions aimed at regulating the activity of executive authorities. It is acquiring the status of a system of public guarantees at the center of which are the rights, freedoms, and lawful interests of the individual and the citizen. This transformation results from a doctrinal shift from a state-centered to a human-centered model of legal thinking, in which public administration is viewed not as the exercise of authoritative powers but as service to the individual.

In the context of European integration and martial law, the issue of ensuring citizens' rights and freedoms in the sphere of public administration becomes particularly significant. The quality of administrative-law mechanisms determines not only the effectiveness of executive authorities, but also the level of citizens'

trust in the state, the legitimacy of its actions, and the resilience of the constitutional order. The rule of law, which is the foundation of the European legal order, requires that any state interference with human rights and freedoms occur exclusively on the basis of law, in compliance with the principles of legal certainty, proportionality, and predictability.

The relevance of the topic is reinforced by the need for a doctrinal understanding of the role of administrative law in ensuring human rights and freedoms not only as a regulatory instrument, but also as a mechanism of personal legal security. At the same time, it is important to examine how administrative procedures, administrative liability, and the system of public control can guarantee the realization of human rights and freedoms, rather than merely restricting them in the public interest.

2. Analysis of publications.

Considering the scientific positions of V.B. Averianov, O.F. Andriiko, O.V. Skrypniuk, S.V. Golovaty, Yu.S. Shemshuchenko, I.V. Lutsky and other scholars, it can be concluded that the problem of human and citizen rights and freedoms in the administrative-law framework of Ukraine.

3. The purpose of the article is to analyze administrative law as a branch that ensures the realization, safeguarding, and protection of human rights within the system of public administration, and to clarify the doctrinal, institutional, and procedural foundations of this process.

Achieving this purpose requires solving the following tasks: to analyze scholarly approaches to the correlation between administrative law and human rights; to identify mechanisms for the realization of human rights in the activities of executive authorities; to characterize guarantees of administrative appeal, oversight, and judicial protection; and to formulate directions for improving legislation in the context of European standards of good governance and the rule of law.

4. Presentation of the main material.

The Constitution of Ukraine has enshrined a basic axiom of the modern legal order: the human being, their life and dignity are recognized as the highest social value, and the activity of the state is directed toward affirming and ensuring human rights and freedoms. This provision has not only a declarative, but also a normative-programmatic meaning, as it determines the vector of development of the entire system of public administration, including administrative law as its normative legal expression. At the constitutional level, rights and freedoms acquire the status not merely of a legal object of protection, but of a fundamental category that shapes the limits and the substance of public authority activity.

According to Articles 3, 8, 19, 55, and 64 of the Constitution of Ukraine, human rights determine the content and direction of state activity, and executive authorities may act only on the basis, within the limits of their powers, and in the manner provided by the Constitution and the laws of Ukraine. This lays the foundation for the fundamental doctrine of the legal limitation of public power, which precludes arbitrary interference in the sphere of citizens' rights and freedoms. Accordingly, administrative law appears not as a system of means by which the state influences the individual, but as a mechanism for implementing constitutional guarantees and for controlling the exercise of authoritative powers. It is at the level of administrative-law regulation that the rule of law acquires practical meaning, being transformed into concrete mechanisms for protecting the person from excessive state interference.

The Concept for the Protection of Human Rights and Freedoms in Ukraine, adopted in 2019 and developing constitutional provisions, states that the state must ensure the creation of effective mechanisms of legal protection, access to justice, and equality of all before the law. The content of this Concept indicates a gradual evolution of state policy from a declarative to a functional level of guaranteeing rights, in which administrative law plays a key role. Through administrative procedures, the system of administrative justice, and bodies of oversight and appeal, the constitutional right of citizens to an effective remedy is

implemented, as provided for by Article 55 of the Constitution of Ukraine and Article 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

In the constitutional-law system, the rule of law is regarded not only as a formal principle of organizing power, but also as a value-based and axiological category. In this sense, administrative law should develop as an instrument for ensuring the rule of law, where the main object of regulation is not the authoritative competence of executive authorities, but the rights and freedoms of the individual in relations with the state.[1] Ukrainian legal scholars see this as the principal feature of the modern Ukrainian model of administrative law, which should be based on the unity of the rule-of-law state and the social state, where human rights become the measure of the effectiveness of public administration.

In the context of Ukraine's integration into the European legal space, the interconnection of the Constitution of Ukraine with international standards for human rights protection acquires particular importance. The European Convention on Human Rights, the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, and Council of Europe documents on the principles of good governance form a normative field for modernizing administrative-law institutions. Their influence is manifested in the development of the concept of proportionality, the certainty of administrative procedures, access to information, and the publicity of administrative decisions. Importantly, in the European legal order, human rights are treated not only as a subject of judicial protection, but also as a principle of organizing administrative activity that has direct effect at the level of every executive authority.

In this context, administrative law serves as a kind of 'bridge' between constitutional principles and the practice of public administration. It transforms constitutional provisions on dignity, freedom, equality, and justice into specific norms, procedures, and forms of activity of public authorities. It is precisely through administrative-law instruments that the state fulfills its duty to 'affirm and ensure human rights and freedoms' (Article 3 of the Constitution of Ukraine). In this sense, administrative law is not limited to the normative expression of state will but becomes a dynamic system of legal guarantees that shapes a new quality of public administration - accountable, open, and person-oriented.

Therefore, the constitutional-law foundations of ensuring human rights form the primary level at which administrative law realizes its social mission. It combines formal-legal certainty with the value dimension of law, turning the rule of law from a declaration into an effective criterion for the legality of executive authorities' actions. It is in this plane that administrative law reveals its genuine potential to be not an instrument of imperative power, but a guarantee of dignity, justice, and human security in a democratic state [2].

In national legal doctrine and international standards of democratic governance, a key idea has become established: national security is not only the protection of territories or institutions, but above all the protection of human rights, freedoms, and dignity. The Constitution of Ukraine clearly enshrined this approach in Article 3, according to which 'the human being, their life and health, honor and dignity, inviolability and security are recognized as the highest social value'. In systemic connection with the provisions of Articles 17, 29, 64, and 92 of the Basic Law, this norm is transformed into a conceptual formula: without law there is no secure life; without security there is no law.

Such an understanding causes a radical reorientation of emphases in the sphere of national security. Its aim becomes not the abstract stability of the state, but the realization and protection of constitutional rights and freedoms under real threats - both from external aggressors and from internal destructive processes. In this context, national security acquires an anthropocentric (human-centered) meaning, in which state functions are secondary to human needs [3].

National security cannot be treated as a state of isolated protection detached from the value-based and legal system of the state. Its criteria, sources of legitimacy, and the limits of the powers of security actors - all these elements must derive from the Constitution of Ukraine as the supreme legal act that determines the boundaries of what is permissible even in periods of extreme challenges. That is why security policy must have a constitutional-law vector, be not only effective, but also lawful, proportional, and controllable.

The experience of the full-scale war has shown that national security which does not rely on institutional guarantees of human rights loses not only legitimacy, but also capacity. Violations of rights, arbitrary restrictions, unjustified secrecy, and unexplained procedures do not strengthen security; on the contrary, they generate internal instability, reduce trust in the state, demoralize society, and complicate the achievement of strategic goals.

Therefore, at the current stage of shaping state policy in the field of national security, it is necessary to rethink security as a function of public law, based on such doctrinal principles as: the rule of law as a method of risk governance; the inviolability of basic rights even in periods of extraordinary circumstances; procedural certainty and accountability of security bodies' actions; and legal rehabilitation and restoration of rights after the end of an emergency regime.

All the above-mentioned principles require reflection both in law enforcement and in updating the constitutional doctrine of national security - as a phenomenon grounded in law rather than only in force.

In the constitutional model of Ukraine's national security, civil society is regarded not only as a subject of democratic control and participation in decision-making, but also as an independent object of security protection. This position is substantiated both by internal transformations of the public space under conditions of war and by external challenges related to hybrid threats, information aggression, attempts to undermine trust in institutions, and manipulations of public sentiment.

The Constitution of Ukraine does not directly use the term 'civil society'; however, through a number of articles it establishes the foundations for its functioning (Article 15 - ideological diversity; Article 34 - freedom of thought and speech; Article 36 - freedom of association; Article 38 - the right to participate in the administration of state affairs; Article 39 - the right to peaceful assembly). These provisions form a foundation of guarantees for the functioning of civil society as a sphere of free self-organization of citizens in the form of parties, associations, initiatives, media, expert structures, charitable organizations, and volunteer movements.

Under wartime conditions, there is a need to constitutionally conceptualize civil society as an object of national security in three dimensions:

1. Social resilience – civil society organizations play a critical role in maintaining social cohesion, humanitarian support, mobilizing resources, and communication between the state and the population.

2. Information security - independent media, public analytical centers, and fact-checking platforms act as a counterweight to disinformation, facilitate a rational public discourse, and help counter information attacks.

3. Preventing institutional erosion - the function of oversight over public authority, anti-corruption activity, and the protection of rights and freedoms ensures the stability of democratic institutions and the legitimacy of security decisions.

In this context, it is proposed to:

– recognize, within national security legislation, a separate section devoted to protecting civil society as a component of national security;

– identify threats directed against civil society institutions (repressive interference, discreditation, institutional exhaustion, manipulative capture);

– include representatives of civil society in consultative bodies in the field of security at the national and regional levels (in particular, within the National Security and Defense Council, regional military administrations, and strategic planning);

– introduce mechanisms for protection against disinformation influence aimed at demoralizing volunteer initiatives, humanitarian sabotage, and provocations by hostile structures;

– ensure the legal and physical protection of volunteers, civic activists, and independent journalists, including in combat zones and in de-occupied territories.

Thus, recognizing civil society not only as a subject but also as an object of national security corresponds to the spirit of the Constitution of Ukraine, the principle of human-centrism, and modern standards of democratic security. Without its preservation, resilience, and legal protection, it is impossible to realize the strategic goal of a secure, lawful, and free society even under martial law [4].

Ensuring human rights and freedoms is a defining criterion of the legitimacy of the modern state, and administrative law is its principal instrument that ensures the practical realization of these rights within the system of public administration. Through mechanisms of administrative governance, the state transforms constitutional values into real guarantees, giving the individual the possibility to effectively exercise their rights rather than merely possess them formally. In this context, standards both national, formed within the legal system of Ukraine, and international, setting global benchmarks for democratic governance - are of key importance.

National standards of administration in the sphere of human rights and freedoms are embedded in the Constitution of Ukraine; the Laws 'On Citizens' Appeals', 'On Administrative Procedure', 'On the Security Service of Ukraine', 'On the National Police', 'On the National Security of Ukraine', as well as numerous sectoral normative acts. Their common purpose is to ensure legality, equality, openness, and accountability in the activity of executive authorities. The Constitution of Ukraine (Articles 3, 8, 19, 55) enshrines a fundamental principle: human rights and freedoms determine the content and direction of state activity, and public authorities are obliged to act only on the basis, within the limits of their powers, and in the manner provided by law. This prescription forms the legal foundation of a national standard of administrative conduct of the state - the principle of legal certainty and proportionality of administrative impact [5].

An important role in the formation of a modern system of national standards was played by the adoption of the Law of Ukraine 'On Administrative Procedure' (2022), which initiated a new era of public administration. For the first time, it consolidated universal principles of the administrative process - the rule of law, officiality, impartiality, proportionality, the right to be heard, reasoned decisions, openness, and predictability. This law forms a procedural framework through which the constitutional principle of respect for human dignity is realized. Its adoption marks the transition of Ukrainian administrative law from a post-Soviet model of governance to a European model of service-oriented administration, in which the citizen is a partner rather than a subordinate of the state.

An important component of national standards is also administrative justice, which embodies the right to a fair trial and effective protection against acts of public authority. The Code of Administrative Procedure of Ukraine (2005) enshrined the principle of public responsibility of authorities, and the case law of the Supreme Court gradually shapes standards of law enforcement in cases concerning violations of human rights in the sphere of administration. Thus, national standards in Ukraine constitute a multi-level system encompassing both normative prescriptions and administrative procedures, law-enforcement practice, and judicial review.

International standards of administration in the field of human rights have a universal character while also providing a comparative dimension for the development of national law. A central place among them is occupied by documents of the United Nations, the Council of Europe, and the European Union, as well as the case law of the European Court of Human Rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), and the European Convention on Human Rights (1950) affirm principles that became the foundations for administrative standards: legality, good governance, an effective remedy, publicity, and proportionality.

The case law of the ECHR is of particular significance for Ukrainian administrative law because it forms 'living law' - standards of good administration. Judgments in Kudla v. Poland, Klass v. Germany, Öneryildiz v. Turkey, and Hirvisaari v. Finland established that the state must ensure not only the legality of administrative decisions, but also their quality, reasonableness, and foreseeability. The judicial doctrine of good governance includes three components: the state's duty to act reasonably and in the interests of the individual; ensuring access to information and the right to be heard; and ensuring effective review of

administrative decisions by an independent body. These principles constitute the core of modern European administrative law, into which Ukraine is gradually integrating.

An important reference point for the national system is also the European Code of Good Administrative Behaviour (2001), adopted by the European Parliament. It systematically defines ethical and procedural principles of public administration: impartiality, proportionality, equality, the right to be heard, the right to a reasoned decision, good faith, and transparency. This document became the basis for establishing a unified standard of relations between the state and the citizen, where administrative action cannot be arbitrary and every public competence has a moral and legal boundary.

In addition to the European level, standards of good administration are also formed within global initiatives - particularly the UN principles of good governance (1999), which emphasize the rule of law, effectiveness, accountability, public participation, and respect for human rights. In international governance indicators (World Bank Governance Indicators, UNDP Human Development Index), the rule of law and the quality of public administration are identified as key indicators of national security and sustainable development.

It is important that Ukraine, having ratified a number of international treaties and strategic documents, has undertaken to harmonize its administrative legislation with EU standards. European integration processes imply not only the implementation of directives but also strengthening institutional capacity - creating a stable civil service, transparent decision-making procedures, and effective control and monitoring. Such harmonization does not mean copying; it presupposes the creative development of the Ukrainian model of administrative law based on European principles of the rule of law, good governance, and the primacy of the individual [6].

Thus, national and international standards of administration in the sphere of ensuring human rights and freedoms constitute a unified, multi-level system in which national legislation, international treaties, and judicial practice interact as elements of an integral legal space. This interaction creates conditions for forming a qualitatively new culture of public administration - administration based on dignity, transparency, and legal accountability. Ultimately, it is the integration of national and international standards of administration that guarantees that human rights will cease to be a declaration and will become a real, functioning mechanism of state policy [7].

The axiomatic method occupies a special place in the science of administrative law because it allows a system of legal regulation to be built not on random assumptions or situational political decisions, but on immutable values and principles that constitute the foundations of the legal order. In the sphere of ensuring human rights and freedoms, this method plays not only a gnoseological, but also a constructive function, because it is through it that the state forms legal architectonics in which rights are not proclaimed, but realized through a stable system of norms, procedures, and guarantees.

In the classical sense, an axiom is a proposition the truth of which does not require proof because it follows from the very nature of things. In law, axiomaticity is expressed through principles that are recognized as self-evident for any democratic society: human dignity, the rule of law, justice, equality, proportionality, and humanism. These principles are not the result of opportunistic lawmaking; they are metaphysical foundations of law, its natural core. Thanks to the axiomatic method, such fundamental truths are fixed in the system of positive law, transforming moral imperatives into standards of conduct for public authorities.

In the context of the legal provision of human rights and freedoms, the axiomatic method performs the function of ontological stabilization of law. When society experiences crisis periods - war, social cataclysms, economic turbulence - it is legal axioms that preserve the inviolability of legal landmarks. The person cannot be a means of policy; dignity is not subject to limitation; no expediency can justify arbitrariness. These postulates have a universal character and serve as a measure of the legality of any administrative decision. Therefore, the axiomatic method is not an abstract philosophy, but a concrete instrument for testing the actions of public authorities for compliance with the value foundations of law [8].

Applying the axiomatic approach in administrative law makes it possible to form a system of value constants that determine the character of public administration. Thus, the rule of law is not merely a legal

formula, but an axiom that precedes any normative decision. The principle of proportionality is an axiom of equilibrium between the state interest and human rights. The principle of legal certainty is an axiom of the predictability of public authority. Together they form a logical system in which every norm of administrative law must be tested for compliance with the axiomatic core a kind of 'constitution' of legal thinking.

The axiomatic method is also a means of integrating national and international law. International human rights standards enshrined in UN, Council of Europe, and EU instruments are not merely treaties; they are manifestations of universal legal axioms that operate equally in all democratic states. When Ukrainian administrative law implements these standards, it effectively reproduces the axiomatic level of law that unites different legal systems by common principles of humanism, justice, equality, and responsibility. In this way, the axiomatic method becomes a methodological bridge between national and international legal consciousness.

In contemporary administrative-law scholarship, the axiomatic approach is increasingly used as an instrument for evaluating the quality of lawmaking and law enforcement. Its essence lies in the fact that any normative act or administrative decision is checked for compliance with basic legal axioms - dignity, freedom, legality, responsibility, and equality. If a norm contradicts an axiom, it cannot be considered part of law, even if it is formally adopted by the state. Thus, the axiomatic method creates a kind of filter of legal legitimacy that separates the legal from the non-legal, the just from the merely formally lawful.

Axiomatic thinking is also a prerequisite for the ethicalization of public administration. When an official perceives law not as an instruction, but as a system of value truths, their decisions acquire a moral dimension. They act not because it is ordered, but because it is just and lawful. This type of administrative culture corresponds to modern European standards of good administration, in which the effectiveness of public administration is inseparable from moral responsibility.

Therefore, the axiomatic method is not only a scholarly tool for understanding law, but also a practical means of its development. It makes it possible to combine normative certainty and spiritual substance, legal precision and humanistic orientation. In the sphere of ensuring human rights and freedoms, the axiomatic method ensures the stability of the legal order, serving as a safeguard against arbitrariness, political pressure, and moral relativism. Through it, administrative law becomes not merely a branch of public administration, but a space of justice in which human dignity is not the goal of regulation, but its indisputable axiom.

The effectiveness of ensuring human rights and freedoms is not a quantitative indicator of the activity of state institutions, but a qualitative characteristic of the maturity of the legal system, which determines its ability to turn normative declarations into real guarantees. It reflects not only the state of legislation, but above all the level of the state's responsibility to the individual, the measure of citizens' trust in public authority, and the degree of internal coherence between law, power, and morality. In this sense, effectiveness is not only a managerial category, but first and foremost a legal and axiological one, because it is in it that the living nature of the rule of law is revealed.

In modern legal understanding, effectiveness in the sphere of human rights and freedoms manifests itself in the state's ability to create legal mechanisms that ensure three interrelated processes: preventing violations, rapid and fair restoration of violated rights, and forming a stable culture of legality. These processes form a dynamic cycle in which law functions not as a reaction to a problem, but as a system of safeguards and incentives. Such effectiveness has not only a normative, but also a moral basis: it is impossible without public authorities' sense of serving the individual.

The legal dimension of the effectiveness of ensuring human rights and freedoms lies in the combination of three elements - normative, procedural, and value-based. The normative element determines how clearly, logically, and systematically legislation fixes rights, obligations, and guarantees. The procedural element reflects the quality of administrative processes, the transparency, accessibility, and reasonableness of decisions by public authorities. The value-based element testifies to the conformity of administrative practice with humanistic principles of law dignity, justice, good faith, and proportionality. It is their unity that forms legal effectiveness in the profound sense.

It is important that, in a rule-of-law state, effectiveness is measured not only by the result, but also by how it is achieved. In the sphere of human rights and freedoms, it is unacceptable to equate effectiveness with expediency, because legal means must be morally and legally justified. Hence follows a principle that may be called the axiom of legal effectiveness: no goal can justify a violation of human rights. This postulate affirms that the effectiveness of the state cannot be the antipode of humanity. In a legal system, a result is meaningless without a legitimate, lawful, and morally acceptable way of attaining it.

Under martial law, the issue of effectiveness acquires special significance because public administration is carried out under restrictions affecting fundamental rights. However, even in such circumstances, effectiveness must rely on the principle of proportionality - that is, commensurability between the need to ensure security and the preservation of basic freedoms. A state that is capable of guaranteeing rights even in wartime demonstrates the highest level of legal maturity. This is the criterion of genuine legitimacy of public authority - its capacity to remain lawful even when circumstances test the boundaries of legality.

In the context of administrative law, the effectiveness of ensuring human rights and freedoms means the harmonious functioning of a public administration mechanism in which executive authorities not only comply with norms, but also actively form an environment of trust. It is about creating such procedures and standards that minimize the possibility of abuse of power, ensure predictability of administrative decisions, and guarantee everyone's right to be heard. This requires not only legal technique, but also a profound transformation of administrative culture - a transition from administrative coercion to administrative partnership.

A significant role in shaping effectiveness is played by the mechanism of control and supervision, which ensures the legal accountability of public authority. Control is not a restriction, but a form of feedback through which law maintains its effectiveness. Public, parliamentary, and judicial oversight create a multi-level system of guarantees that makes arbitrariness impossible. It is thanks to such oversight that administrative law fulfills its social function - to be an artery of trust between public authority and society [9].

International legal experience confirms that the effectiveness of human rights protection is simultaneously a measure of the effectiveness of the state. In numerous judgments, the ECHR emphasizes that rights must be 'practical and effective, not theoretical and illusory'. This approach directly correlates with the Ukrainian doctrine of public administration, in which human-centrism acquires not a rhetorical, but a procedural meaning. As a result, a model of law is formed that not only proclaims freedoms but embodies them in the real actions of public authorities.

Thus, the effectiveness of the legal provision of human rights and freedoms is the result of the coherence of legal norms, moral values, and administrative actions. It reflects the level of institutional resilience of the state, its ability not only to declare rights, but also to implement them through transparent procedures, accountability, and trust. In the contemporary dimension, effectiveness means not the power of coercion, but the power of trust; not the severity of the law, but its humanity; not external control, but an internal awareness of responsibility. This is the legal meaning and civilizational purpose of administrative law - to make human freedom not an object of protection, but a natural form of life in a rule-of-law state.

5. Conclusions.

Modern administrative law appears not simply as a branch of public administration, but as a universal mechanism for ensuring and protecting human rights, combining legal logic, moral responsibility, and public trust. It is increasingly transforming from an instrument of exercising state power into a form of legal partnership between the state and the citizen, in which the central content is service to law rather than the will of the governing subject.

Within Ukraine's legal system, a profound transformation of the administrative-law paradigm is taking place: from state-centrism to human-centrism and further - to socio-centrism, which combines the protection

of the individual with overarching social responsibility. This transition indicates the formation of a new model of public administration in which human rights are viewed not as constraints on the state, but as the meaning of its existence.

Ensuring rights and freedoms is impossible without the development of clear national and international standards of administration. Ukraine is gradually integrating European principles of good administration, the rule of law, proportionality, and good governance into its legal system. In this process, administrative law becomes a space for reconciling internal and external values - moral, legal, and political - into a unified system of rule-of-law statehood.

A special place in this context belongs to the axiomatic method, which performs the function of the methodological core of administrative law. Through it, immutable legal truths are fixed - dignity, justice, equality, legality, and responsibility. The axiomatic approach provides law with internal stability and makes it possible to distinguish the legal from the merely formally lawful, the morally just from the politically expedient.

The effectiveness of the legal provision of human rights and freedoms serves as the final criterion of the quality of public administration. It is expressed in the ability of law to anticipate, prevent, and respond fairly to violations, creating an atmosphere of trust between public authority and society. In the contemporary dimension, effectiveness is determined not by the force of compulsion, but by the force of trust; not by the strictness of the law, but by its humanity; not by external supervision, but by an internal awareness of responsibility.

Administrative law, in its renewed form, appears as the moral and legal framework of public administration in which the highest values of legal civilization are concentrated - dignity, freedom, justice, and security. Its development is not only a scholarly, but also a state-building task, because the quality of Ukrainian statehood depends on the level of its humanism.

Ultimately, it is through administrative law that the modern idea of a rule-of-law state is realized: not the state above the person, but the state for the person; not power as coercion, but power as service. Here lies its highest manifestation of effectiveness - the ability to protect freedom without violating its essence and to ensure order without devaluing human dignity.

References:

1. Averianov, V. B. (2004). Administrative law of Ukraine. Academic course: In 2 vols. Vol. 1: General part. Yurydychna Dumka.

2. Andriiko, O. F. (2004). Control in the sphere of executive power: Organizational and legal foundations. Naukova Dumka.

3. Skrypniuk, O. V. (2015). Constitutional foundations for ensuring human rights and freedoms in Ukraine. Naukova Dumka.

4. Shemshuchenko, Yu. S. (2020). State, law, and the human being: Interaction in the face of contemporary challenges. V. M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law, NAS of Ukraine.

5. Bezzubov, D. O., & Koval, M. V. (2024). Value dimensions of administrative law in the national security system. Bulletin of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine, 31(4), 167–180.

6. Tsvietkov, V. V. (2021). Public administration in the field of national security: Legal mechanisms of implementation. National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine.

7. Lipkan, V. A. (2008). Theory of national security. KNT.

8. Kaminska, N. V. (2016). International information security in the context of globalization and integration. In International law: Today's challenges: Proceedings of the international scientific and practical internet conference (pp. 22–27). KNUTE.

9. Petryshyn, O. V. (2018). Legal doctrine and its role in state-building. Pravo.

Olga Andriyko,
Corresponding member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
Doctor of Law, Professor
V. M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law of
National Academy of Science of Ukraine
Department of Public Administration and Administrative Law
V. M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law, NASU
E-mail: idpnan219@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-7507-3090

Dmytro Bezzubov,
Doctor of Law, Professor
V. M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law of
National Academy of Science of Ukraine
Department of Public Administration and Administrative Law
V. M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law, NASU
E-mail: dbezzubov@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0001-7183-5206

Oleksandr Skrypniuk,
Candidate of Law
Senior Researcher, Department of Constitutional Law and
Local Self-Government
V. M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law of
National Academy of Science of Ukraine
E-mail: Alexander.Skrypniuk@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0001-5620-7762

Volodymyr Nagrebelny,
Candidate of Law,
Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine,
Deputy Director of the V. M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law
E-mail: idpnan219@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-4201-4243